THE PROTESTANT

Editor
KENNETH LESLIE

Associate Editors
JAMES LUTHER ADAMS JOHN HAMMOND GERALD RICHARDSON

Editorial Secretary
KATHERINE KASTOREA

Distribution Manager
SANFORD ARCHIBALD

Editorial Advisers

RUTH NANDA ANSHEN
LEE H. BALL
RUSSELL C. BARBOUR
C. HARRISON BECKER
ADAM BHILIPPOVSKY
G. A. BORGESE
DWIGHT J. BRADLEY
OTTO BRAND
HENRIETTA BUCKMASTER
R. ALEX CAMERON
JEROME DAVIS
JOSEPH F. FLETCHER
PAUL J. FOLINO
ERWIN A. GAEDE
H. M. GOOCH
JOSEPH HAROUTUNIAN
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
CHESTER E. HODGSON
DANIEL HUGHES
EDWIN H. HUGHES
HEWLETT JOHNSON
J. SPENCER KENNARD, JR.
FREDERICK D. KERSHNER
STANTON LAUTENSCHLAGER
JOHN A. LEE
B. B. COMER LILE
DAVID LORD
DONALD LOTHROP
JOHN MACMURRAY
H. D. A. MAJOR
ANTONIO MANGANO
JOHN A. F. MAYNARD
FRANCIS J. MCCONNELL
JOSEPH G. MOORE
LOUIE D. NEWTON
ROBERT H. NICHOLS
JOSEPH NOVOTNY
DRYDEN L. PHELPS
HAROLD C. PHILLIPS
A. CLAYTON POWELL
IDA PRUITT
TRACY M. PULLMAN
LESLIE ROBERTS
RAYMOND ROBINS
D. R. SHARPE
ALFRED STIERNOTTE
ALVA TAYLOR
WATSON THOMPSON
GREGORY VLASTOS
O. WALTER WAGNER
WILFRED WAKEFIELD
RUFUS W. WEAVER
HENRY N. WIEMAN

VOL. VII APRIL-MAY, 1947 No. 7

TWO-WAY CHRISTIAN-COMMUNIST BRIDGE

And Other Editorials by KENNETH LESLIE

Cold-blooded Imperialism

We publish this issue of THE PROTESTANT under the shadow of a great crime. The crime is America's and none here may escape its burden or its consequence. The crime is Britain's too and Canada's and Australia's—it belongs to all who have not cried out against it, and its consequences will fall upon all of us, whether we have cried out against it or not. It is the crime of cowardice, the doctrine of terror and blind force. It is the craven abandonment of the faith by which America has lived. The America of Lincoln and Jefferson and Tom Paine has become suddenly an overgrown boy with the tantrums. He has atoms in his pockets. He screams, I want the world. And he won't take no for an answer.

But this crime didn't take place the other day when President Truman proclaimed a world civil war. This crime was started when we became accessories before during and after the fact of the murder of the young Spanish Republic. And the crime started there was the same crime that now breeds this doctrine of *fear of an idea.*

To be afraid of an idea is ultimately to capitulate to that idea. When you lose the argument and then shoot your opponent you have still lost the argument and

if you shoot him first and then tell the world that he was a godless bolshevik and the world is better off without him—you must keep right on shooting all who don't agree with you. Even if you shoot everybody . . . well, you've still lost the argument —and probably also the ability to argue, in other words your reason. That's what the Inquisition was about and the Dies Committee and that's what the present witch-hunt is about.

A mark of maturity in a person or nation is the capacity to think ill of one's self without despairing of one's self—in other words the power of self-criticism. So we find it difficult to analyze our foreign policy and to see, what is apparent to all the world outside these shores, that it is a policy of cynical imperialist aggression, at once economic, political and military.

Many, including the State Department and Mr. Walter Lippman, have tried to regularize this policy of American aggression with the majority of Americans who still, sentimentally at least, pay allegiance to democratic ideas. They talk of Marshall's withdrawal of some Marines from China as if that had been an about-face in our Chinese policy, whereas this withdrawal had been planned to take place when Marshall should have completed his mission, which finished with Chiang in position to wipe out the democratic people's government of one hundred million Chinese. The withdrawal of the Marines, if they were withdrawn, was the signal for full-scale war on his own people by Chiang Kai-Shek using American-trained troops and American lend-lease . . . and now an American navy.

Not that this hadn't been going on before Marshall arrived and during his stay in China, as he was well aware. We had given Chiang three or four billion dollars worth of war stuff—we had trained and armed forty divisions for him, we had shipped his armies—thirteen divisions—to fight a civil war which is as much a cold-blooded invasion as it is a civil war. And so the descendants of the men of Lexington, Bunker Hill and Valley Forge are helping to fasten tyranny on the necks of the Chinese people. A sickening spectacle, one however, which in all its shame should be looked at long and steadily by American liberals if they are ever to generate enough passion to do something effective about it.

There is little that the State Department or Mr. Lippman or Mr. Dulles or Mr. Luce or any other of our "moral and spiritual leaders" can do really to cover the nakedness of our imperialism. The *New York Times* published on March 16, 1947 a map entitled "As We Move Into A Larger Role in World Affairs." In the center of the map is the U.S. and from it arrows run across the map to "Ten Areas of Importance for the U.S." These arrows run across the Pacific to China, Korea, Japan, the Philippines, and the island bases of the Pacific, all designated as *U.S. spheres of influence.*

On the other side of the world, although Great Britain is not named as our sphere of influence, yet, since the Empire's difficulties in the *Time's* pretty language "pose new world problems for the U.S.," both Britain *and* her Empire become part and parcel of America's world concern.

Other arrows run to the Middle-East which "with large U.S. oil stakes, is of growing importance." Turkey and Greece are not indicated on this map as U.S. spheres of influence, since it was published before President Truman had taken them over.

Iraq, however, Lybia, Egypt, Palestine and half of Africa, not to speak of India, are all in the Anglo-American sphere of influence. The map shows clearly that, whereas the influence of the Soviet Union has been enlarged in an area *close to her own borders,* United States influence on the other hand is not concerned with any area at all near her borders but rather with territory *as close to the Soviet Union as Canada and Mexico are to the United States.* For instance American oil interests

are tremendous in the Middle-East a short jump south of the Soviet border. American troops occupy Japan and American troops occupy Southern Korea. These territories are as close to the Soviet Union as the West Indies are to the United States. It would seem from the most casual glance at this map that whatever aggression there may be in the world is *towards, not from,* the Soviet Union, especially when it is remembered that the war left that country well-nigh devastated and left the U.S. in a position of power undreamt in the annals of man.

Our Blushing "Liberals"

Now in the face of these facts it becomes too obviously a tongue-in-cheek performance for our "liberals" to go on trying to justify American aggression as it sticks out like a sore thumb in numerous places thousands of miles from the U.S. Some of these "liberals" are becoming really a drug on the market. For this reason they join the tally-ho of the officially fostered murder-bund against the American Communist Party. *Does the very ferocity of the attack upon the Communist Party measure perhaps the degree of guilt in the American conscience as the hour strikes in which we turn our backs once and for all upon the last vestige of our liberal tradition?*

Nor does it stop here. This is only the start. Already the Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs, William Benton, stretches the attack upon the Communist Party to include the Soviet Information Bureau, the Soviet Embassies with their press staffs and publications, the Tass News Agency, the All-Union International Book Combine, the combine for foreign cinema trade, and the All-Union Committee for Radio Broadcasting and Radio Communication. Over and above the local Communist parties these other organs carry on "psychological warfare" against the United States, says Mr. Benton. Whether or not this can be argued with any plausibility there can be no argument about the significance of Mr. Benton's remarks as quoted in the *New York Times* of March 20, 1947. His words, coming as they do from an important official of the State Department can only mean one thing: that all agencies including the embassy of the USSR are not welcome in the United States.

THE BITTER FRUIT OF FULTON

When Churchill during World War II took sorely needed British soldiers out of the African campaign and sent them into Greece to help Greek resistance against the Nazis this was considered a gallant and noble thing to do.

Later events have proved that Churchill's objective was the classic objective of Britain, to keep the balance of power in Europe. Therefore he put soldiers in Greece, not only to stop the German fascists but to stop the Greek people from getting rid of their own fascism. In other words he was hedging on the war before it was won.

Now in the *New York Times* and *Life* magazine Churchill quotes his own Fulton speech of last year when he said that of all countries in Eastern Europe "Athens alone, with its immortal glories, is free to decide its future at an election under British, American and French observation."

Then he says that this is not seriously challenged except in Communist circles. But the former Premier of Greece, Themistocles Sofoulis, a Right-wing Liberal, challenges Churchill's veracity in no uncertain words as also does the eye-witness report of three British Members of Parliament, Norman Dodds, Stanley Tiffany and Leslie Solley. "Throughout our visit," say the MP's, we found that, with the exception of the extreme Right wing, everybody said that the election was

carried through by means of forgery, perjury, terrorism, assassination and every possible form of corrupt practice."

Archbishop Kozani, whom THE PROTESTANT has invited to this country but who is unable to get a visa, assures us that the EAM is not Communist although it contains Communist elements, probably about one-fifth of its number. As the British MP's express it, "Just as happened in Nazi Germany, anybody who disapproves of the present government is immediately dubbed a 'Communist.' Even the Right-wing Liberals, the party of Mr. Sofoulis, are characterized as Communists, as Mr. Sofoulis himself told us."

The British delegation concludes, "GREECE IS RAPIDLY BECOMING A FASCIST STATE. UNDER A FACADE OF DEMOCRACY, THERE EXISTS A UNILATERAL CIVIL WAR, WAR OF THE EXTREME RIGHT AGAINST ALL DEMOCRATIC ELEMENTS WHO DARE TO DISAGREE WITH THE GOVERNMENT. MURDER, ILLEGAL IMPRISONMENT, BRUTAL ASSAULT AND INTIMIDATION ARE THE FATE OF THOUSANDS OF VICTIMS. THE GENDARMERIE AND POLICE ARE FASCIST AND ROTTEN TO THE CORE AND TAKE A FOREMOST PART IN THESE CRIMINAL ACTIVITIES AND OPENLY COLLABORATE WITH THE X-ITES, THE FASCIST TERRORISTS."

Churchill may be correct when he says that the overwhelming weight of American public opinion supports him. If this is so it is because American common sense has been led astray by the long-continued vociferous and unanimous propaganda of the American press in behalf of the new anti-Comintern, semi-officially instituted at Fulton.

Now that this propaganda has had its effect and the American people have been hoodwinked to such an extent that they can accept with equanimity President Truman's commitment of America to the cause of tyranny in a world civil war, Churchill can go even further than he did in his Fulton oration and can quote the spokesman of the State Department as follows: "A Communist-dominated Government in Greece would be considered dangerous to United States security."

This is the bitter fruit of Fulton. He can go further and say that in the eyes of the present British labor government "A Communist-dominated government in Greece would be dangerous to British security." He can pat himself on the back and say to himself, good old Winnie, you told them what was what and it wasn't long before they had to come around to your way of thinking. He gets his own back from Stettinius who was Secretary of State in 1944 and who was at that time, according to Churchill, "sourly critical." Even Roosevelt "remained silent under a series of personal protesting telegrams from me." Thus too he gets his own back from his dead comrade-in-arms.

Roosevelt is gone and the days of Roosevelt are gone. These are new days and the political climate of America has changed so that Churchill, buoyed up by the anti-Communist flood here in this country, is moved to quote Dean Acheson once more as a preacher repeats a text, so as to rub it in and make it stick, "A Communist-dominated Government in Greece would be considered dangerous to United States security." 'It is a good text for Churchill and it is a woeful text for the world.

For at the other end of the Mediterranean is Fascist Spain, and Fascist Spain is not to be considered dangerous to United States security. Evidently the change from the Roosevelt climate to the Truman climate may be expressed thus: Whereas in the Roosevelt days we considered Communism an ally in the world war against Fascism today we consider Fascism an ally in the world war against Communism.

BETWEEN CHRISTIANITY AND COMMUNISM MAN IS BEING TORN TO PIECES

We have referred in these columns to a theologian who regretted the abandonment of the Chinese Communists by the Russians. Many likewise reproached the Russians with being unable to give effective help in 1936 to the Spanish government. Such regrets and reproaches are tributes to the enduring hold the Russian revolution has upon their imaginations. Yet these same liberals are preciously emphatic in drawing a clear line, nay, an impassable gulf between themselves and Communism. We do not draw such a line. We fix no such impassable gulf. It is the purpose, the mission of THE PROTESTANT to build bridges between Communism and Christendom, while being perfectly aware that there are both Communists and Christians who do not wish to build bridges and who say: *No salvation outside the Church, or outside the Party!*

The atom bomb, the whip of fear has laid down a new ultimatum to man: *world peace or world suicide.* But man is not a beast to be driven by the whip of fear. God did not make him that way, but as a being to be reasoned with, and to do things because he himself feels he *ought* to do them, rather than because he *must* do them.

So, while the atom bomb says to Communism and Christendom you *must* find a way to get along together, Reason says to Christendom and Communism there is a great deal that you have in common, and it is for the sake of these things that you have in common that I ask you in my own name, the name of Reason, to examine the things you have in common, to let your minds move over them easily and see if these common things do not increase in area and depth until from your hearts themselves you could never think of engaging in mortal combat but will rather search each other out with a great tenderness and understanding.

There is more involved here than the avoidance of catastrophic war between the Socialist Federations and the Cartel-Vatican Empires. What is involved is an historical amnesia, a cutting off of man from his past. Communism is a child of Christendom. Jewish and Christian values are the seeds of Communism. They enter into its texture and condition its growth. Without them the Communistic dream might well become a nightmare. So also Communism is a long suppressed and betrayed element in Christian and Jewish church life.

What the Christian Church Did to Jesus

With the exception of a thin red line of Christian Communist groups, which reaches from the days of Jesus to the days of the Anabaptists and even to certain present-day sects, the Christian Church, having entered into an alliance with the powers of this world, has forced itself to forget that Jesus and his disciples preached what today we would call Judeo-Bolshevism and that the members of the early New Testament churches had all things in common. The Christian church, pushing back into the darkness of its own subconscious the revolutionary character of Jesus, betraying the truth and burying its betrayal in mountains of sermons and books has been, since Constantine made it his ally, the hand-servant of exploitation and tyranny. To relieve the burden of his message, to dull its cutting edge, theologians removed Jesus to another sphere, rationalized away his sharp perceptions of the corruptive power of wealth and pride of scholarship, sentimentalized his hard sayings, pictured him with the composite face of those very suave silk-beards who did away with him, lisped of the "gentle Jesus" (and still lisp) to exploiters who have one need and one only, to get the real Jesus out of their hair and out of their consciences.

For the strange thing is, and it is a miracle of history, that the other Jesus,

the rough one, yes, that Jesus with a bit of the Bolshevik about him, comes through the barrage of false tones and unnatural accents, plunges through the false faces and confronts us with his upsetting way of life.

That way of life fits humanity as skin fits flesh. The honest scientist knows it, any honest worker knows it who loves his work for its own sake and not for the gold it brings. Steinmetz knew it, who asked but cigars and a laboratory to work in. Good teachers know it. Even good traders and organizers of business know it when they forget the stakes in the joy of organization. But the trouble is, and businessmen in their moments of relaxation are quite aware of it, that their organizations get out of hand. They work human hardship, lay-offs, migrations, economic imbalance, wars. These results are beyond their power to control. The materials of big business are too fraught with possibilities of wholesale pain and terror and of deserts of human emptiness and frustration for them to remain in haphazard hands. Henry Ford, a mechanic, becomes an emperor with more power than any Caesar. How can he be expected to wield such power? Rockefeller rationalizes the oil business and is catapulted into a power that is forced by its gigantic structure to straddle the biggest war in history. That's the West.

In the East the Bolsheviks are running the business of Russia in trust for the people. On the whole they have done a good job, partly because they have been helped by organizing brains from Western Capitalism. These brains, some of them at least, have been repaid not so much in money as in satisfaction in using their God-given powers as they were intended to be used, for the sheer joy of being useful.

This is an example out of the past of the bridges we have spoken of. The war was another.

Side by side the Bolshevik East and the Capitalist West fought the Nazi through some of the most anxious moments this planet has ever endured. Of that battle the Bolsheviks took the brunt and suffered the most. The bridge was strong in the days of Stalingrad.

Where is that bridge today? If we could blow away the smoke of hate fuelled by old ecclesiastical rivalries and new capitalist terrors we would see a shining bridge and a stream of two-way traffic on it. But the traffic is not of big-shots. The traffic is of the millions and millions of minds of ordinary work folk, minds which without passports visit back and forth, back and forth. And once in a while they visit in the flesh, like Louie Newton and Ralph Sockman, like the Soviet group recently welcomed throughout England, like the head of the Russian Baptists who is coming now to tell us the truth about freedom of religion in Russia.

But we need more than this. We need thinkers who will build a *basic causeway of understanding between Communism and Christianity.* These thinkers will never get a chance to go to work however unless the anti-war forces are activated both here and in England and realistically England is the focal point for *action now.*

ENGLAND: AMERICA'S EXPENDABLE COLONY

England must make a declaration of independence from America if she is to survive. It hardly needs adding that with England destroyed America would feel very lonely in the world. It is up to England to restrain America.

You may recall that toward the end of last year, when the British people were beginning to complain that John Bull was tied to the coat tails of Uncle Sam, Foreign Minister Bevin said on the radio that "Britain does not tie herself to anybody."

The *London Economist,* however, knew better and said so, reminding Bevin that "Britain is, by treaty, explicitly and closely tied to Turkey, to Iraq, to Egypt, to Portugal," and that according to article four of the Anglo-Soviet alliance of May, 1942, the British and Russian goverments looked forward to the adoption of "proposals for common action to preserve peace and resist aggression in the post-war period."

Of course what Bevin meant was that the American loan placed no mortgage on Britain's domestic or foreign policy. Although technically this may have been correct there can be no doubt as to American intentions, which were clearly expressed by advocates of the loan. These were to hold Britain in the circle of capitalist nations and to prevent her from falling into the Russian orbit.

In the case of a war between the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. the shield of the U.S.A. would be Britain and the blows falling on that shield would be more than enough to dent it. Britain is a concentrated target and whatever the ultimate outcome of the war she would likely be utterly destroyed.

This is why 111 members of the British parliament joined Wallace's team against war. Ninety per cent of the British people are on the same team. Wallace performed a very real service to humanity in going to England at this moment when there is more danger of war than the British possibly realize.

The British were nearly knocked out by the war just finished. They simply would not countenance a new one, and especially not with their recent comrades-in-arms, the Russians.

We fear that if there is war between Anglo-America and Russia the English will be unwilling partners. Of course the British cartelists and their relatives will pack up and come to America. We understand that some of them have already made arrangements. But watching the smokestacks of Pittsburgh and Youngstown mushroom and multiply and the smokestacks of Sheffield and Manchester crumble into dust the people of Britain may reorient their foreign policy away from a war which means their obliteration.

There are, we are informed, even financial interests in England which believe that the Russians could be persuaded to give dependable assurances of non-interference in British business from the Mediterranean down into India. Reciprocal British assurances would be given not to interfere with presently Sovietized regions in those areas nor with legitimate Soviet interest in access to the world's seaways. It is true that both the British and the Russians know how to make agreements and to keep them if they have been made on a solid basis of mutual interest. From the point of view of these businessmen it might be to the interest of the British to try to live at peace with Russia rather than passively to watch the *Pax Britannica* melt into the *Pax Americana.*

Of course it may be too much to hope that those who control Britain's destiny will be large-minded enough to grasp the opportunity presented by Russia's need and by the world's need in fact by its own need *to align itself in peace with the Russian orbit* and to make a united stand with Russia against what seems to be a world-suicide pact of the Vatican with America. Up to now the labor government has been less imperialistic than the Tories, envisaging a development out of the old imperialism into an enlarged commonwealth of free peoples integrated in turn with the united nations of the world, but it has not yet been able, so far as we can learn, to enlarge its world view to the point where it can imagine a creative working relationship with the Soviet Union. That there are obstacles on the Soviet side we do not doubt nor do we doubt that a great deal of patience might be necessary to lead the Soviet Union into this new perspective. One thing is clear: *there*

is little hope that America can be turned aside from her present berserk imperialism unless Britain definitely opposes it. That is the hope.

Far be it from our intention to write off America now and forever as a force for good in the world. But we must be realistic, and it is just as necessary to look at things from the short view as from the long view. Unless we clear the harbor reef we will not cross the ocean. The plain fact is that the powers that be in America, the Morgans, the Baruchs, the Spellmans with their political henchmen have got the anti-Soviet bit tightly clenched in their teeth and will run with it until they drop. Whatever the sane portions of Church and business here may do, we may depend on haywire big business and the war-mad Roman Church to undo. This is clear.

It is in England that two motives meet, the motive to do the right thing and the motive to do the sensible thing; the motive to be good and the motive to be. It is the accident of having been nearer to the last war than America was that makes the motive to survive more keenly felt in England than in America.

Therefore Wallace has done exactly the correct thing in going to England and telling the people there of what confronts them if they keep on following the Churchill-Truman line: war and destruction.

Our free churchmen, devotees of democracy, should establish lines of communication with one of the world's sources of democracy, the British people.

THE FASCIST PLAN FOR AMERICA

Political priests and lay priests have forced the people here onto the defensive, pushing upon them a false choice, a false polarity between the Vatican and the Kremlin.

In this Russia-Rome tug-of-war they tell us we must choose one or the other. Since Communism has been made anathema in the public eye by an American goebbels-propaganda everyone is scared to death of being called a Red or a pro-Russian. This leaves Rome with the field: *Attack Rome* and *be called a Red* has developed into *Join Rome* or *be called a Red.*

The plan is so to shape things up here in America that American Fascism will be Roman Catholic or at least *Christian with Roman leadership.* That is the plan. To make it succeed the war drums must be beaten. Russia must be the focus to draw all eyes from what goes forward here. While the monopolists gouge the public with high prices and see to it that labor gets the blame, the priests "pray at" Russia. Strikes are provoked in public services, railroads, telephones, coal, so that the public will be psychologically prepared for the re-enslavement of labor via a return to the "freedom" of the open shop. The press and movies are building the Roman Church into a position of unassailable prestige. There can be no doubt that certain powerful banking circles have allied themselves with the Roman Church and have undertaken to keep the Protestant churches in line. "Religion" was never quoted higher on the Stock Exchange.

THE PROTESTANT has an opportunity and an obligation in this situation to provide a vehicle of expression for those free churchmen who refuse the bankers' invitation and who repudiate American Fascism in any form.

This means exposing the propaganda that is the base for American Fascism: a new anti-Comintern both domestic and foreign. Domestic in the red witch-hunt and foreign in the Greek-Turkish arms loan. We must expose and repudiate both. For both are long steps towards Fascism and will bring us into conflict with the aroused conscience of the world.

As to the Greek-Turkish business the Vandenberg preamble to the loan law drew the UN into a position more than ever subservient to the U.S. for the preamble states that the "furnishing of such assistance to Greece and Turkey by the United States will contribute to the freedom and independence of all members of the United Nations in conformity with the principles and purposes of the Charter." Thus is made a not too subtle transference, making the *Charter underwrite the new anti-Comintern.*

There is one thing we should be thankful for. President Truman has simplified the issue. As Hitler committed his crimes under legal formulations so we subsume our crime against the Greek people under the Charter.

TRAPS FOR THE UNWARY

A new organization, Common Cause, has been started by Mrs. Natalie Wales Latham, endorsed by Sumner Welles and President Day of Cornell. It has been given a send-off with a letter from John Foster Dulles who calls on America to fulfill the mission of world leadership that is now challenged by others. Obviously referring to Russia he says "We have faltered and others seek to lead. They would have societies which deny the sanctity of the human personality and force the individual into a spiritual strait jacket designed by their rulers." Common Cause, says Mr. Dulles, will arouse Americans to meet the challenge, "and its purposes and principles deserve vigorous support."

Common Cause would of course not operate without its "religious" wing. This has blossomed out as the "National Religious Council of Common Cause." Among its clerics are the Rev. Edward A. Conway, Jesuit, of Washington; the Rev. John F. Cronin, Assistant Director of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, Washington; the Rev. Dr. Frederick May Eliot, President of the American Unitarian Association; the Rev. Dana McLean Greeley, Secretary of the American Unitarian Association; Rabbi Morris S. Lazaron of Baltimore; the Rev. Benjamin L. Masse, editor of *America,* the Jesuit publication; the Rev. Francis J. Murphy, Secretary of Education in the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of New York; Bishop Edward L. Parsons, Retired, of the Protestant Episcopal Diocese of California; Dr. Wilhelm Pauck, of Chicago Theological Seminary; Dean Claude W. Sprouse of Grace and Holy Trinity Protestant Episcopal Cathedral, Kansas City, Mo.; Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam of the New York Area of the Methodist Church.

Will we never learn? How can liberal Protestants like Bishops Parsons and Oxnam be taken in by such an obvious substitute for the Pattern for Peace? The title of this organization is clever and unfortunately it will draw the support of many people of good will.

Another organization "Citizens Incorporated" comes as a suggestion from Henry Pitney Van Dusen, President of Union Theological Seminary. The purpose of this organiation would be to represent "the interest of the whole people above the interest of any segment." In other words, it would be the pressure group to end all pressure groups or to defend the common interest against them.

Mr. Van Dusen, worried over the meat stoppage and the heat stoppage which imperiled the health of the nation and threatened to paralyze its economy, feels that American democracy is threatened with intimidation and dictation by the mass power of labor.

Mr. Van Dusen makes his suggestion in the lead editorial in *Christianity and Crisis:* "The ominous fact is: the bedrock of American democracy, vaguely yet adequately identified as the middle and professional classes, is rapidly losing effec-

tive voice in the affairs of state. It is not too much to say that upon these elements of the population the Republic has been reared, that more than any other elements they retain understanding of and loyalty to the true genius of the nation, and that, whether through their own distinctive virtues or merely through self-interest, they still represent the interest of the nation as a whole."

These are the people he would organize into Citizens Incorporated. These people are not "labor" and they are not "capital." They are people of fixed incomes, beneficiaries of institutions, people of modest savings and prudent thrift which "are the virtues and protections of our most solid and substantial citizenry." Mr. Van Dusen says that capital and labor have made common cause in the inflationary drift of post-war economy, victimizing these worthy individuals of the middle class whose real interest is also the general interest. This middle class protests against the squeeze. "But that protest is well nigh impotent."

Mr. Van Dusen is looking for an organization which will represent the interests of the middle class and which will arbitrate between other special interests and he ends up with the question "Can the will of those who represent the general interest over every particular interest be made effective in American life?" The title of his whole editorial is "Can The People Act?" Having identified "the people" with the middle "income" classes his question becomes can the middle classes act? He would like to see an organization "Citizens Incorporated" act for these classes.

A middle class pressure group such as Mr. Van Dusen envisages would be interested in holding the line against changes which would threaten its fixed income. In the struggle between the cartels and labor it would tend to be drawn into the cartel plan for subjugating labor for the simple reason that the cartels control the means of communication and also *are the benefactors* who own or control "the great institutions of public welfare—churches, hospitals, education, philanthropy." Mr. Van Dusen himself, rather ironically, is a victim of the illusion that those who create these institutions are different people from those who run the cartels. For, as he puts it, the vicious incidence of the liquidation of the value of fixed incomes falls first and most fatally upon the great philanthropic institutions—"and then upon those who have created these institutions and who support their continuance."

Mr. Van Dusen goes further and announces that "the active membership of the churches whom they may hope to guide is drawn predominantly from precisely those elements in the population which we may call 'the general public,' those individuals and groups whose self-interest on the whole coincides with the general welfare. It is a legitimate role of the churches, indeed an inescapable responsibility to bring their constituencies to intelligent understanding of this issue which lies at the root of most of our domestic maladies and of the dimensions of the peril." It is difficult not to identify this attitude of Mr. Van Dusen in a general way with the attitude of those who would freeze our social development at the point of its present status. To identify America with the predicament of its fixed income classes is to cast America's destiny with large capital or with a cartelized economy of scarcity and war. Mr. Van Dusen follows out here the same instinct which prompted him to write in *Life* magazine his exhortation for all-out American aid to Nationalist China with which our large capital hopes to do large business.

Understanding is the name of a quarterly put out by the National Association of Manufacturers "Devoted to Cooperation Between Clergymen and Businessmen." It was started in September, 1946. Jasper E. Crane, who is the chairman of the NAM Committee on Cooperation with Churches wrote the opening article,

using as his text a passage from John Foster Dulles which states that "our free land . . . provides the spiritual, intellectual and economic conditions which all men want . . ." Citing the rising tide of collectivism and statism Mr. Crane calls upon the Church to remember the pilgrims who established here the system of individual enterprise. Socialism, he says, violates religious principles. The American system is the best in the world, he says, and only in this system can Americans continue to improve their standard of living. Crane is a Presbyterian elder and a member of the Board of Directors of the E. I. duPont de Nemours and Company, Inc., manufacturers of gun powder who would make a lot of money out of a brand new world war. Among those quoted approvingly in the first issue are editorials from *America, Christianity and Crisis, The Pulpit,* and *The Christian Herald.* Conferences between businessmen and clergy have been promoted throughout the country. Roman Catholic priests are joining with Protestant ministers in this movement. Copies of this quarterly may be had by writing to 14 W. 49 St., New York 20, N. Y. It should be watched closely.

DR. SHUSTER ASKS A BILLION

—". . . we must not be too squeamish."

When some time ago we identified Dr. George N. Shuster as a protagonist of the Vatican pro-Nazi, pro-Fascist policy some of our readers refused to believe it and charged us with being unfair to the gentleman who is head of one of our largest public institutions of learning and who was an American delegate to the United Nations Educational, Scientific, Cultural Organization meeting at Paris.

At a meeting on April 8, 1947 in Boston, as reported in the *Boston Post,* Dr. Shuster told the 44th annual convention of the National Catholic Educational Association:

"There are in western Europe and central Europe no energies other than those of Catholicism capable of assuming leadership in resisting the onward sweep of totalitarianism. . . A corps of Catholic zealots are needed in Europe to combat it . . . The reasons are two-fold. First, every other important group is in some manner allied either with capitalism in the predatory sense or with Marxism. Second, other groups will follow Catholic leadership if it is offered . . . I suggest that American Catholics prepare to spend $25,000,000 to $50,000,000 on financing that venture." Later he said that the $50,000,000 sum was really small and that he would like to see $1,000,000,000 devoted to the work, reports the *Boston Post.*

"With these sums we can muster a corps of experts and later of workers here and abroad, eager to labor in the spirit of the great Jesuits who in the 17th century won back Poland and gained a strong foothold even at the court of Catherine of Russia. Only this time the majority of them must be laymen, and we must not be too squeamish about each of them except in terms of his complete dedication to the cause . . . I believe that this is the hour of our destiny."

We wonder if Dr. Shuster reminded his hearers that Catherine of Russia gave refuge to the Jesuit order at a time when that order was banned from the whole of Christendom by the Roman Pope himself. Of course it scarcely matters because the Jesuits didn't take long to regain their influential place in the Church. The Jesuits have always been and remain today the spearhead of anti-Protestantism and no one understands this better than Dr. Shuster who is turning out to be an important leader among the Jesuit fellow-travellers of these times. The coming Jesuit crusade will indeed be something to be reckoned with.

THE PROTESTANT must repeat once more what it has said so many times. We repudiate the suggestion that Protestants will follow Catholic leadership in a new anti-Comintern. We know there are millions of Protestants who would find much more that they can agree with in Marxism than in Catholicism. Indeed, although they believe that such a choice is not at all necessary, nevertheless if the choice were necessary they would choose Marxism over against Catholic fascism. They have read the little apocalypse in St. Matthew and they would choose the substance which denies the form over against the form which denies the substance.

If Dr. Shuster wished honestly to argue the case on its merits we would welcome his statement of his side of the argument. But this is not so. All the moral relativism, all the cynical materialism, all the ruthless search for power, attributed by Dr. Shuster to Communism, are attributable to political Christendom whose hands are still wet with the blood of six million Jews murdered by the Nazis who according to this same Dr. Shuster were chosen by the Papacy as its bulwark against Communism.

Christians will say here as they said in Europe that it was right to support the Nazis in attacking Communism although it was unfortunate that the Nazis in attacking Communism also attacked the Jews. These Christians, and those Jews who are naive enough to argee, will say that the new world fascists are different from the old world fascists and will not attack the Jews. This is because the Shusters, Sheens and the rest of the sponsors of the revived anti-Comintern have made a belated effort to conceal their enmity for the Jews. This effort is out at the elbows and gone in the seat. But the patty-cake inter-faith societies (as if "*the* Faith" could or would ever recognize such a term as *inter*-faith) see to it that our good people are kept in total darkness as to the real purpose of the Sheens, Shusters, Sheils and Shaughnessys. This is to Make America Christian. What place will a Jew or an Agnostic or any free individual have in a State which is subservient to a Church?

THE JEWISH PROBLEM IS POLITICAL CHRISTIANITY

The American Jewish Committee has sponsored scientific studies at several universities to analyze and treat religious prejudice as an "emotional illness." Dr. John Slawson, Executive Vice-Chairman of the American Jewish Committee reports that "these studies, in which major universities throughout the country are taking part, are intended to analyze prejudices and show how they are formed. The studies treat bigotry as an emotional illness and will endeavor to show its true nature in clinical terms."

The American Jewish Committee has been extremely active in the project of destroying THE PROTESTANT. Why? Possibly because THE PROTESTANT has exposed the primal source of anti-Semitism in Christian ecclesiastical instruction. This instruction, having the well nigh irresistible power of religious feeling with which to drive home its message, is replete with such passages as the following:

Compendium of Bible and Church History, A book of Religion for Catholic Elementary Schools, by Rev. Brother Eugene, O.S.F., Litt.D., published by William H. Sadlier, Inc., N. Y., 1931.

> "The Jews hated Our Lord. They saw His miracles and heard His sublime teaching, but their hearts remained untouched. Their anger knew no bounds when they saw the crowds that followed the Saviour eager to hear Him and to get a glimpse of His heavenly countenance. Though divided among themselves into conflicting parties, they were a unit in trying to draw from Him some expression which they

might turn against Him and thus bring about His ruin. So, too, the enemies of the Catholic church disagree among themselves and set up all sorts of so-called churches. They can unite on only one thing, their opposition to the truths of the Catholic faith." (P. 181)

"The terrible saying, 'His blood be upon us and our children,' was fulfilled to the letter. Judas committed suicide. Caiphas was deposed; Herod died in exile; the sons of Annas perished by the hands of assassins. At the siege of Jerusalem, the blood of the Jews flowed through its streets and ditches and in streams down the temple steps. And ever since the Jews have wandered about, a people without a flag, a country, a priest, an altar, or a sacrifice, a living testimony that indeed the vengeance of God fell upon them and their children." (P. 199)

The Passion of Our Lord, A Physiological Study, by Lieut. Col. P. W. O'Gorman, C.M.G., M.R.C.P., D.P.H., I.M.S., ret., published by Central Bureau, Catholic Central Verein of America, St. Louis, Mo., 1929.

"In this abject condition, with chest and shoulders seamed with the purple and scarlet weals of His stripes, exposing the lacerated flesh and pouring with blood; His sacred face swollen, besmeared with dirt, empurpled with bruises and clots of gore; with eyes red and inflamed, and the whole countenance battered out of recognition; His head encircled with vengeful thorns fixed to penetration into the scalp and oozing blood . . . And, alas, in their blind rage they even invoked upon themselves a terrible curse: 'His blood be upon us and upon our children!' " (P. 14)

"Footnote — The dire results of this dreadful self-inflicted curse and the deliberate rejection of the Messiah were soon seen, as prophesied, in the utter destruction of the temple and Jerusalem, the final cessation of sacrifices, and the dispersion of the Jews to the four corners of the earth."

The Four Gospels, by S. Ridout, published by Loizeaux Bros., Bible Truth Depot, N. Y.

"How solemnly does Judas stand for the apostate nation! They, too, for imagined temporal advantage, sold their Messiah, and with the price have gained but a burial place for strangers—which the world has been to them ever since." (Pp. 90-91)

The Passion and the Death of Jesus Christ, written by St. Alphonsus de Liguori, published by The Redemptorist Fathers, Brooklyn, N. Y. The author is a doctor and saint of the Church and its great authority on moral law.

"Unhappy Jews! you then said, *His blood be upon us and upon our children.* You have prayed for the chastisement; it has already come. Your nation bears, and shall bear to the end of the world, the punishment due to the shedding of that innocent blood." (Pp. 188-9)

The Sacrament of Catholic Action, written by Daniel A. Lord, S.J., who is the author of our movie code of morals, published by The Queens Work, St. Louis, Mo., copyright 1936. Imprimatur of P. P. Crane, V.G.

"The Jews went back to the hard and reassuring realities of gold and trade and to the complacency of being the one chosen race that could in consequence of God's predestined favor do no harm, nor lose permanently God's election whatever its crimes." (P. 7)

Studies in Religion, For High School and Adult Groups, Authors — The Rev. Joseph Ludwig and The Rev. Hilary R. Weger, published by William H. Sadlier, Inc., New York-Chicago.

"The occasion for the introduction of the Inquisition in Spain was furnished by the Spanish Jews. No other European State had suffered, to the extent that Spain was then suffering, from the unrelenting system of usury and organized extortion practiced by these dangerous aliens. Persecutions were the natural consequence, and often the only alternative before the Jews was baptism or death. Thus the number of merely nominal converts to the Christian faith soon became very great. The secret Jews were incomparably more dangerous than those who openly professed their (Jewish) religion. If the latter monopolized the greater part of the wealth and commerce of the country, the former threatened alike the Spanish nationality

> and the Christian Faith. On the one hand they contrived to insinuate themselves into a number of ecclesiastical charges and even to become bishops, and on the other to attain to high municipal honours and to marry into all the noble families. These advantages, and their great wealth, were all covertly devoted to the gradual subjugation of the Spaniards and the undermining of their Faith in favor of the Jews and Judaism. Things had latterly come to such a pass that the very existence of Christian Spain was at stake." (P. 53: Lesson 17)

Dr. Slawson reports that the American Jewish Committee is backing a new institute for research into methods of Jewish education in the United States. Its objective will be establishment of experimental schools to test new methods of providing religious instruction to American Jewish children. A third project announced by the committee is the strengthening of the spiritual resources of the Jews in Europe.

It is really no wonder that the American Jewish Committee attacks THE PROTESTANT. In dealing with anti-Semitism THE PROTESTANT looks in those places where anti-Semitism is to be found, namely among anti-Semites. We do not find anti-Semites among Jewish people nor do we find anti-Semitism in those places where scientific projects go forward, in the free public schools or universities of this country. Furthermore THE PROTESTANT has not found any anti-Semites who wish to have their emotional illness analyzed or treated by experts.

It is rather sickening to think that any organization should deal with anti-Semitism by delving into methods of Jewish education in the United States. Not that these projects are not admirable in themselves. They are. But they are irrelevant to the true meaning of anti-Semitism as it rears its ugly head throughout the United States today. As we have often repeated anti-Semitism is a tool of fascism. The American Jewish Committee will have nothing to do with fighting fascism. In fact they go out of their way to appease the forces of fascism by attacking the anti-fascist PROTESTANT. In doing this and in making people think that scientific studies will at this date stop anti-Semitism they serve the cause of fascist anti-Semites. THE PROTESTANT has been resolute in its refusal to compromise in this issue. Our uncompromising position is an American position and should have the support of all free democratic Americans. It is a sad fact that as of today the American Jewish Congress is joined to the American Jewish Committee in an unfair attack upon THE PROTESTANT. We happen to know that large sections of the American Jewish Congress were shocked and pained when they found themselves involved in this attack. We remain silent and we wait. And while we wait our hand remains extended in friendship to those who strike us, knowing that they are striking a friend. We repeat once more that anti-Semitism is a Christian sin. The roots of it are plainly seen in Christian texts. Democracy, if it is to survive, must see to it that these texts are cleansed and that children of the democratic family may not be predisposed to hate one another. The basic fallacy in treating anti-Semitism as an emotional illness is that sick people must know they are sick before they will come to a doctor. The time has come in America when the conditions which give rise to anti-Semitism must be done away with. It is criminal folly to permit the germs of this emotional illness to be spread by thousands of pest houses and at the same time to pretend that you are stopping the pest by holding it under a microscope in a laboratory.

The attack upon THE PROTESTANT by the National Community Relations Advisory Council (a Jewish organization dominated by American Jewish Committee influence although there is no indication of this in its title) has been well used by

all of the parochial press and was carried in heavy type in leading Hearst editorials throughout the country.

The logical and factual weakness of the attack is shown by its opening statement that the 'Protestant' "has no connection with any official body of the Protestant church." Of course THE PROTESTANT has never claimed such connection; indeed our claim has been that we have no such connection. It is true that those ministers who belong to our Ministerial Action Committees are officially connected with their own churches and those churches are Protestant churches. It is also true that many of these churches both officially and unofficially support THE PROTESTANT.

The NCRAC says that THE PROTESTANT contributes to inter-group dissension. This is how the NCRAC interprets our anti-fascist activities. This charge of contributing to inter-group dissension originates among pro-fascists in all groups who fear THE PROTESTANT and who have aroused the NCRAC to attack THE PROTESTANT. It is tragic indeed that the rank and file of American Jewry have been involved in an attack upon an anti-fascist organization. Our ministers intend to visit the central committees of those Jewish organizations which have attacked THE PROTESTANT in order to persuade these committees of their tragic mistake.

The Christian front potentates may have hoped that by inducing Jewish organizations to attack THE PROTESTANT we might have been tempted to attack Jewish organizational life and to use some expressions which might be interpreted to be anti-Semitic. These potentates inherit a tradition of deceitful guile which matches their tradition of ruthless force. We shall never take such transparent bait.

PAPACY FIGHTS JEWISH PALESTINE

In the August-September, 1945 issue of THE PROTESTANT we quoted Msgr. Thomas J. McMahon, secretary of the Catholic Near East Welfare Association as saying with regard to Palestine "These shrines are ours. Ours they should remain." And we went on to say that the British government would find the Papacy its chief adversary in any plan to implement justice for the Jew in Palestine. Msgr. McMahon has written an article in *The Priest* January, 1947 in which he states that we have purposefully misunderstood him. Yet he goes on to say in this article that "Few have dared to mention the patent fact that Palestine is our Christian Holy Land. The entire Holy Land is a Christian sanctuary: it is Christianity's cradle." Quoting further, "Our whole problem centers around keeping Christ in His Homeland . . ."

Dr. McMahon turns down the solution of the Christian problem in Palestine by the establishment of the "State or Enclave of the Holy Places" as a division of the partition plan. It would be strange logic, he says on the part of Christians "to admit that Jesus Christ could be exiled from any place which bears the indelible marks of His sacred footsteps. The Holy Land has been rightly called a Christian sanctuary centering around the sepulchre of Christ." Of course Dr. McMahon does not suggest at present that Jews be kept out of Palestine although his language in discussing the tragedy of modern Jewry is peculiar to say the least: "The Jews have been trailing their own blood across the length and breadth of Europe since the mad Hitler began his sadistic regime . . . decimated, with their homelessness further accentuated, the prospect of their national home in Palestine has grown into an impetuous necessity in these, our post war days." There is an overtone in Dr. McMahon's description reflecting that kind of "Christian" teaching which maintains that the "homelessness" of the Jews is their proper punishment for remaining true to their religion. Dr. McMahon turns from the "impetuous necessity" of the Jews to the general problem of the displaced persons of Europe, 75% of

whom he says, are Catholics. "Would to God," says Dr. McMahon, "the delegates to the United Nations deliberations could turn for even a moment from the bogey man of Fascism to the far more pressing problem of the homeless and the persecuted."

Dr. McMahon is strangely anxious that the problem of the displaced persons should be separated from the present situation in Palestine. As to the "Jewish state" he remarks pregnantly that "for the first time in the history of Palestine the Christian and the Moslem Arabs have found an identical national interest. The Christians . . . oppose the confiding of their santuaries to a Jewish state."

But Dr. McMahon doesn't think much better of an Arab State. According to the Koran a Moslem who turns Christian is subject to the death penalty. Where then, asks the monsignor, is true freedom of worship? Ah, but reverend sir, the Moslems don't do that any more. Didn't the Moslems help the Christian Franco to bring "freedom of worship" to Spain?

By a process of elimination we may see what Dr. McMahon is seeking even although he may not state it openly in this article. He doesn't want an enclave system. He doesn't want a Jewish State. He doesn't want an Arab State. An Arab-Jewish State he thinks would enjoy only an "ephemeral period of peaceful cohabitation." His final solution is that Palestine should be "a Big Power protectorate to keep Christ in His Homeland." What the Christian asks for (and by Christian he of course means Roman Catholic), says Dr. McMahon, is "freedom of religion and freedom of religious organization." "If a plan that is blind to Christian and Catholic rights is adopted for Palestine, the very stones of our Holy Places will cry out."

If a plan is adopted, blind perhaps to that special interest calling itself "Christian and Catholic" but watchful of the interests of world brotherhood, justice and democracy, we believe the stones of the Holy Places will remain at peace. It is in Spain today where in very truth the stones cry out, echoing the tortured cries of the victims of the sanctified government of that "Christian and Catholic" country, which Dr. McMahon's namesake, the Roman Catholic columnist, Dr. Francis E. McMahon, having just escaped from there calls "a prison housing 25,000,000 people."

THE PROTESTANT believes that Christians may very safely confide their sanctuaries to a Jewish State. Moreover we believe that the Christian world is indeed a heartless and cruel world if it cannot make the gesture of returning its homeland to the Jewish people as a slight atonement for its own long-held and carefully nurtured anti-Semitism.

Mr. Ludwig Lewisohn has said that there are two kinds of countries in the world today and only two, those who want to get rid of their remaining Jews and those who will let no Jews in. Paul Eldridge in *The Humanist,* January, 1946, is very pessimistic concerning the future of the Jew in America. He says "America is the dead end of the Jewish wandering. What follows now will be destruction or reintegration in their old homes." He says that the Jew is finished in America. "The Jew knows it, knows it in his blood and marrow, knows it even when with braggadocio, he exclaims 'I am an American.' But the echo answers, 'Jew—you don't belong.' And the echo is that of millions and millions becoming more and more vociferous, more and more furious, despite all the heroic efforts of the kind and valiant Christians who are building dykes, destined also to crumble." Professor Salo W. Baron of Columbia University says that the center of anti-Semitism has shifted from the European continent to North and South America. Jacob Leschtinsky, Jewish intellectual who found refuge here is not an admirer of American Jews. He says they are psychologically cowards and of a lower moral status than

the Polish Jews. He feels that American Jews are lost in exactly the same way as Jews are lost in every country of the world with the exception of the national home in Palestine.

We must say that there is evidence for some of these views, but their extreme pessimism is one of the chief obstacles to our work.

We believe that there are fine opportunities for Jewish life to develop throughout the Soviet Union, and especially in the region of Birobijan. We further believe that there is a good hope of holding the dykes here in America against the rising flood of anti-Semitism. This hope will die however if Jewish agencies continue to fight those Christian agencies who are trying to hold the dykes.

Moreover, and this is extremely important, it seems to us completely illogical to think that a world as anti-Semitic as these pessimists would have us believe is going to allow the Jews to develop a homeland of their own in the very spot where anti-Semitism takes its root and has its reason (or unreason): namely in that Palestine which Msgr. McMahon calls Christ's Homeland, a Christian sanctuary centering around the sepulchre of Christ. When we remember that the basis of anti-Semitism is in the Christian teaching of the apostasy of the Jews it is not difficult to see what a world inundated with hatred would do to a Jewish Palestine.

Therefore while we admire those Palestinian Jews who are fighting for their homeland we hope that they will soon take cognizance of the source of the enmity which rises against them throughout the world.

Political Christendom hates the Jew and works feverishly through every foreign chancellory to obstruct, constrain, obliterate him. Official Christendom does not commit murder, but when murders are committed it rubs its hands and says "Too bad but they brought it on themselves." Political Christendom has one other hate beside the Jew, namely, Bolshevism. It is strange that so often the Zionist Jew or the Jew who fights today in Palestine makes common cause with the source of all his trouble and acts as if its enemy in the world today were simply Britain.

If there is one people in the world whose whole destiny as a people rests with the vitality and honesty of a true United Nations (including and taking full account of the Soviet nations) it is the Jewish people.

But let us Christians remember that we as true Christians will live or perish with the Jewish people. We speak not now of churches but of all that is good in our Christian tradition upon which most of our churches today have turned their backs. We are not counsellors to the Jews. We are and shall remain fighters for the equal rights of Jews with those professing other religions under the constitution. We shall contend for the rights of the Jew because in so doing we are fighting for the very existence of the democracy which we believe to be a political expression of the principles of Jesus.

"GENTLEMAN'S AGREEMENT"

Editorial Book Review by MARK H. JOHNSON

Offhand I would have said that any crusade against anti-Semitism would be welcome—even if it was in the form of a clumsy novel. It is an unfortunate truism, however, that the road to hell is paved with good intentions. I think that *Gentleman's Agreement** is a misleading book—an even dangerous book.

Miss Hobson is back in the idyllic era of pre-World War I anti-Semitism. That brand of racial and religious intolerance was primarily a social phenomenon—a combination of snobbery, provincialism, and stupidity. It was uncomfortable for its few victims, and it certainly did no credit to its practitioners. It was not, however, a dangerous threat to the Jews themselves, to the community at large, or to democratic institutions.

Anti-Semitism today, the Hitler variety, is not a merely social phenomenon; it is a political and economic *movement*. It is not a spontaneous development in the warped minds of ignorant people. It is created, fostered, and directed—by people who know precisely what they are doing. That breed of anti-Semitism, as the world was privileged to see in Germany, is at the same time a facet of, and a disguise for, fascism. No handier device for the seizure of political and economic power has yet been discovered. *That* anti-Semitism is without any doubt a grave and imminent threat to the American people and to American institutions.

Miss Hobson manages to miss the point completely, and in missing it she can be dangerously misleading. The fight against fascism needs the support of every available man of good will. If ammunition is wasted on decoys, there is that much less to be used for the real thing. There are certainly more than enough diversionary movements today to misdirect and dissipate the energies of the well-intentioned. *Gentleman's Agreement* is of that ilk.

It is interesting to compare this book with one a year or so older. Arthur Miller's *Focus* is a far better novel, and its message is far more accurate and useful. In both stories, the victim is a gentile. In *Focus,* Lawrence Newman is a neurotic but passive anti-Semite who is forced to wear eyeglasses and thereby acquires a Jewish face. His subsequent education in anti-Semitism, and his moral awakening, are vivid and exciting. In *Gentleman's Agreement,* Philip Green is a liberal magazine writer, who pretends to be Jewish in order to discover the extent of anti-Semitism and its effect upon himself. His contacts are with "respectable" people, and he is amazed and outraged by their reactions. His indignation, however, is a little flat, because the stimuli are relatively trivial. It is the story of social prejudices, restricted neighborhoods, closed jobs, and similar affronts against the dignity and security of a segment of the American nation. There is no hint, however, that America itself is the intended victim of the attack, or that the attack is organized by a small group of politicians, businessmen, and clergy whose aim is the destruction of the America we know.

Miss Hobson is surely right in assuming that the growing army which practices intolerance today is composed largely of politically innocent people. What kind of education can overcome their ignorance or stupidity? Will it do any good merely to assure them that they are ignorant or stupid? The author apparently believes that a few forthright examples of noble and intelligent tolerance by respected people will turn the tide. I doubt it. What *can* be effective is to show these political innocents that they themselves are the true victims.

In *Focus,* Finkelstein's impassioned outburst to Newman makes the point. "Don't you see what they're doing? What the hell can they get out of the Jews? . . . It's you they want, not me. . . . I'm chicken feed, I'm a nothin'. All I'm good for is so they can point to me and everybody else will give them their brains and their money, and then they will have the country. It's a trick, it's a racket. How many times must it happen, how many wars we got to fight in this world before you will understand what they are doing to you?"

The one hope for the people who cherish American democracy is to recognize the forces of reaction, to attack them, and to win over as allies in that fight the vast bulk of unthinking citizens who are now being tricked into political and economic suicide. Because *Gentleman's Agreement* does not recognize that hope, and because instead it offers a panacea which is a snare and a delusion, it is a failure—or worse.

---

*Gentleman's Agreement, by Laura Z. Hobson, Simon & Schuster, New York, 275 pp. $2.75.

BLOCH'S ANSWER TO CLINCHY

[The following letters are self-explanatory. The first is from Dr. Clinchy, President of the National Conference of Christians and Jews in criticism of an article "Holy Inquisition for America" which appeared in the August-September, 1946, issue of THE PROTESTANT. *The second is Dr. Bloch's answer to this criticism.]*

October 1, 1946

Mr. Jacques Coleman
Coleman & Company
468 Fourth Avenue
New York 16, N. Y.

Dear Mr. Coleman:

Your letter of September 24th refers to an article by Joshua Bloch in the August-September issue of THE PROTESTANT entitled "The Holy Inquisition for America." You inquire whether two books by Dr. William Thomas Walsh entitled "Characters of the Inquisition" and "Isabella of Spain" with which, you say, this article deals, are on our list of recommended publications and, if they are, you say that you would like our answer to the criticism that Mr. Bloch makes of these two books.

In 1943 in the Catholic section of our booklists for Religious Book Week appeared "Isabella the Crusader" by Dr. William Thomas Walsh, a shorter version of the authoritative edition published by McBride in 1929, with the notation: "The story of Spain when America was being discovered." We have listed no book entitled "Isabella of Spain."

In 1944 and 1945 in the Catholic section of the book list for Religious Book Week there was included "Saint Teresa of Avila: a Biography, Wm. T. Walsh." These are all the books by Dr. Walsh which we have listed.

Mr. Bloch's article merely names and does not characterize "Isabella of Spain" but is fully occupied by a vigorous attack upon Dr. Walsh's "Characters of the Inquisition." This with other books by Dr. Walsh, Mr. Bloch intimates, the National Conference "went out of its way to have entered in its various lists of recommended publications" and he asserts, at the close of the article, that by recommending Dr. Walsh's books the National Conference "becomes a partner to the dissemination of literature at once anti-Jewish and un-American, literature which in no small measure borders on the subversive."

The truth is that the National Conference has never recommended nor mentioned Dr. Walsh's "Characters of the Inquisition" either in the book lists for Religious Book Week or elsewhere.

You may be interested also in the facts with respect to another statement of Mr. Bloch in the article in question. Mr. Block writes, "It is more than interesting, indeed it is rather significant, that another book, which deals with some aspects of the impact upon the Jews of the Inquisitions' activities and which appeared simultaneously with the publication of Dr. Walsh's work, was for several years deliberately ignored in all of the lists of recommended books issued by the National Conference of Christians and Jews, Inc. I refer to the Jews of Spain, The Jewish Publication Society of America, Philadelphia, 1942, a well written contribution to historical writing by Dr. Abraham A. Neuman." "Such a distinguished book," Mr. Bloch asserts, "was unreasonably and somewhat mys-

teriously banished from the book lists of the National Conference of Christians and Jews. In fact, in 1943, the committee of three reputable Jewish scholars appointed by the National Conference of Christians and Jews to compile the list of Jewish books included Dr. Neuman's work. But when the list was published Dr. Neuman's book was omitted from it, to the embarrassment of the committee and others as well."

This will be of interest to the "three reputable Jewish scholars" who constituted the Jewish book list committee in 1943, Dr. Louis Finkelstein, Dr. Leo Jung and Dr. Jonah B. Wise.

The truth is that we listed in the Jewish section of the book list in 1943 "The Jews in Spain, Abraham A. Neuman, J. Publication Society, Phila., 1942, 2 vols., $2.50 each. An excellent and comprehensive description of Jewish life in Spain." In 1945 we listed this book again with this notation: "An historical study of Jewish life and institutions in Spain from the 12th to the 15th centuries."

Yours sincerely,
EVERETT R. CLINCHY
President

December 16, 1946

Mr. Everett R. Clinchy, President
National Conference of Christians and Jews, Inc.
381 Fourth Avenue
New York

My dear Mr. Clinchy:

I am in receipt of several originals and carbon copies of letters which you and Mr. Willard Johnson have written in reply to inquiries bearing upon the contents of my article, "Holy Inquisition for America?," which appeared in THE PROTESTANT of August-September 1946. After reading these letters, I have checked the "answers" which you furnish your correspondents and compared them carefully with the statements in my article to which they refer. I find no statement in my article which you are able to refute. On the contrary, upon re-reading my article and checking its contents with the data in my possession, I am forced to the conclusion that your letters constitute no more than an unworthy attempt to discredit the veracity of my words. Every statement in your letters, designed to demonstrate lack of truthfulness in my article, represents an apparently deliberate distortion of facts which I have set forth in that article. It is a falsehood wilfully set forth with the obvious intention of deceiving your correspondents. I cannot think otherwise. Were this not so, you would have written to me demanding an explanation of the inaccuracies or you would have requested THE PROTESTANT to publish such corrections to my article as conditions would have warranted. Instead you have resorted to the practice of deception—a practice which, all too often, seems to characterize activities of the National Conference of Christians and Jews.

Now, let me take up all the points which you have raised in your letters by way of objection to my article.

You say that my article "merely names and does not characterize *Isabella of Spain*." I deal with that book on pp. 33 and 34. I certainly characterize it in no uncertain terms. My characterization of both *Isabella of Spain* and the *Characters of the Inquisition* are expressed on p. 33 in the following words:

"These works by Dr. Walsh are well written. Their author offers adequate proof that he is abreast of all the research in the subject with which he deals.

Unfortunately they are marred by a prejudice characteristic of the anti-Semite. Any anti-Jewish libel, no matter how incredible or ridiculous, is passed on by them as valid. Some such libels have long been discredited but for Dr. Walsh they are not questionable; they are true because leading Catholics thought so long ago. Libels such as ritual murder are repeated with all the gruesome allegations and thus apparently aimed at the renewal of their popularization. Dr. Walsh maintains, without any semblance of proof, that the Jews 'had cut out of the Old Testament the prophecies that seemed to Christians to refer so definitely to Jesus' and he does not hesitate to revive many of the unfounded mediaeval charges against the Jews."

Moreover, in support of this characterization there appear on pp. 33 and 34 several quotations taken directly from *Isabella of Spain*. It is true, I do not devote as much space to this book as I do to the *Characters of the Inquisition*. This was not accidental. Dr. Cecil Roth of Oxford, England, dealt with *Isabella of Spain* most adequately, exposing its anti-Semitic character in a manner so convincing that his article found hospitality in a distinguished Catholic quarterly, the *Dublin Review*, October 1932, pp. 219-231. I could hardly improve upon Dr. Roth's excellent exposition of the anti-Semitic character of the book. Surely Dr. Roth's article cannot be unknown to you; yet you did not hesitate to characterize *Isabella of Spain* as an "authoritative" work. Does not this characterization of yours in itself constitute a recommendation? This recommendation is to be found in connection with the listing of Dr. Walsh's equally anti-Semitic *Isabella the Crusader* in one of your book lists for Religious Book Week. You describe it as a "shorter version of the authoritative edition published . . . in 1929."

You say that the truth is "that the National Conference has never recommended nor mentioned Dr. Walsh's *Characters of the Inquisition* either in book lists for Religious Book Week or elsewhere." Is this an honest statement? Is it not a fact that at the time of its publication, in fact, shortly thereafter, the *Characters of the Inquisition* was included in the lists of Religious Books Recently Published which the National Conference supplies to numerous newspapers including *The New York Times?*

Do you venture to doubt that I know what I am talking about when I say that Dr. Abraham A. Neuman's *Jews of Spain* was eliminated from the list of books which your "committee of three reputable Jewish scholars" selected in 1943? This committee consisted not of the men whose names you list in your letters but rather of Professor Jacob R. Marcus of the Hebrew Union College, Dr. A. L. Sachar of the B'nai Brith Hillel Foundation and of Dr. Mordecai Soltes of the Yeshiva University. When their list appeared in connection with Religious Book Week observance Dr. Neuman's book was excluded from it. I have seen letters from members of the committee stating that the book was in their list. Who was responsible for its omission and why? You boast of the fact that in the 1945 list of Religious Books the Neuman book was listed. Don't you know that the committee which you appointed in 1944 to prepare the list, being aware of what had happened the previous year, were careful to see to it that the book be not omitted from their list? In fact at the time when the list was in process of compilation I took occasion to talk to members of that committee regarding the matter.

In what I must regard as utterly irresponsible and not quite responsive to an inquiry is your Mr. Willard Johnson's letter of October 11, 1946, to a correspondent. Mr. Johnson says "that the National Conference does not recommend any of the books contained in the list." Was this said with tongue in cheek?

Mr. Johnson knows quite well that this is not the case. Let me quote the following passage from the foreword of your latest Religious Book List, which appeared in connection with Religious Book Week observance in 1946:

"Each of the three religious sections of this list was selected by a committee of the faith under whose name it appears and is recommended to that special group."

With but a few insignificant verbal changes the quotation is reproduced from the foreword to earlier lists and the words "is recommended" appear in all of them. In view of this published statement would you think it wrong on my part, if I were to say that Mr. Johnson's letter furnishes additional proof of my contention that the practice of deception is not altogether eschewed by the National Conference?

That Mr. Johnson's claim that the National Conference does not recommend books is a deviation from the truth is apparent from the fact that during the weeks of the recent observance of the Jewish High Holydays there appeared in Jewish weeklies a striking ad in which the National Conference recommended to Jews, presumably as appropriate reading during their season of penitence, such a book as the Rev. Dr. Fulton Sheen's *Preface to Religion,* a work that frankly aims at proselytizing of non-Catholics "to the true faith." Fr. Fulton Sheen frankly declares: "There are not many faiths—there is one faith." When Fr. Sheen speaks of "one faith" which, do you think, does he have in mind? I am sure, it is not Judaism.

The publication, during the period of penitence in Jewry, of an ad in the Jewish press containing the National Conference's recommendation of such a book is, in my humble judgment, an affront to those Jews who profess the faith of their fathers. I have no doubt that upon reading the ad, the sensibilities of many a pious Jew must have been wounded deeply.

In the face of all this, how can Mr. Johnson truthfully assert, as he does, that the National Conference does not recommend any books? Mr. Johnson's claim that "the recommendations are made only by members of the various committees" does not absolve the National Conference of responsibility for the recommendations. No committee would dare use the name of the National Conference unless it has authority to do so. Committees appointed by the National Conference for the performance of given tasks act for and with the authority of the National Conference. Don't attempt to shake off responsibility for acts performed in its name and with its full knowledge.

I have written this long letter for the purpose of enlightening you on the false statements which you have passed on in reply to inquiries about my recent article in THE PROTESTANT. You have done me a grave injustice in attempting recklessly to cast doubt upon my veracity. You must undo the damage you have done. Will you please let me know, without any undue delay, what steps you intend to take in this matter? You must remove the injury you have inflicted upon me. Failure on your part to act honorably, and with expedience, in this matter will leave me with no alternative other than to take such legal steps as warranted in the circumstances and to give this letter the widest publicity I can possibly procure for it.

Very truly yours,
JOSHUA BLOCH

A NEW VICHY?

By O. I. ROCHE

ON FEBRUARY 6, 1947, a large and well-dressed crowd gathered in a Paris auditorium to hear Deputy Mutter, representative in the National Assembly of the Republican Liberty Party (PRL). The topic of M. Mutter's speech was "Amnesty."

He demanded that Frenchmen imprisoned for collaboration with the Nazis during the war be set free in the interests of national harmony. One man among his hearers, overcome by emotion, leaped to his feet to testify how he had been condemned to "national dishonor", deprived of his civil rights, merely for collaborating with the Nazis. The audience wildly applauded him. There were cries of "Long live Petain!" and "Death to the Jews!"

Three days later, on February 9, hundreds of thousands of Paris workingmen and women, not so well-dressed, marched for hours from the Place de la Nation to the Place de la Republique. They marched to commemorate their victory over the first attempt at a Fascist putsch in France, in 1934, and to demonstrate their alertness against any new Fascist menace.

This is new, postwar France, the Fourth Republic. Ex-Marshal Petain, in prison, waits senilely for death. Laval is buried. Nazi militarism is crushed into the dust. Vichy is once again merely the name of a watering-place. Petainism, Lavalism, Vichyism, even Nazism, none of them is more than a name any longer.

But the common denominator of them all—Fascism—still survives, in France as in America. Here in Paris, just as in Washington, man is groping between his two alternatives: New Fascism, or New Democracy.

Some months ago, about the time the "Columbians" were being investigated in Georgia, French police decided to investigate a newspaper called "Combatant Europeen". It was pro-fascist, although not much more so than many Paris papers, but the reason for the investigation was merely that it failed to carry an address and masthead.

The police discovered, by this chance investigation, that "Combatant Europeen" was the official organ, in France, of a European Fascist underground, calling itself the "Unitarian Socialist Party". Heading the French branch was an ex-Gestapo aide.

Some sixty leaders of the group were rounded up. Without exception, they were men and women who had collaborated with the Nazis during the war. Some had been jailed for it, then had been realeased. Others were on the "wanted" list. Many of them were listed as former members of the Waffen SS and the Vichy militia.

The immediate program of this "USP", estimated to have had at least 3,000 members, was to release collaborators still held in jail, to arrange escapes for Nazi war prisoners, to hide collaborators and prisoners being sought by the police, and to help the more compromised, such as war criminals, to flee over the border into Franco Spain.

Its ultimate program, so its leaders said, was to unify French Fascists and reactionaries generally for both legal and illegal action, in the hope of taking over the government, by ballot or by bullet.

For several reasons the "USP" has not got very far with its second objective. The main reason was that abler and better-financed brains had already taken the plan over and were working at it from another angle.

Big Business Takes Over

France's "haute bourgeoisie" was badly split during the war. One wing supported Vichy. The other supported the U. S. and Britain. The reasons were

simple enough. The Vichy wing was linked financially with Nazi trusts more than with Anglo-American finance capital. The Anglo-American wing, on the contrary, had closer ties with Wall Street and London's City.

Just as ex-Marshal Petain was the figurehead for the Nazi-linked "haute bourgeoisie," so Gen. Charles deGaulle was the frontman for French financial interests tied to Anglo-American trusts.

Petain's role has been generally recognized, while the role of deGaulle has been somewhat overlooked. Yet the evidence was obvious enough. Such men as Pleven, Diethelm and Rene Mayer of the Rothschild interests, all members of deGaulle's cabinet, were well-known to represent the Anglo-American wing of France's "200 families".

When Nazism was crushed and its trusts taken over by Anglo-American big business, both wings of France's "haute bourgeoisie" naturally fused together. That is, they became just as united, and just as divided, as British and American finance capital in their interests.

The political aims of the new, semi-united "haute bourgeoisie", within France and its colonies, were conditioned by the rise of the French Communist Party. This party, polling five and a half million votes and violently opposed to big business, blocked (and still blocks) political control by the "haute bourgeoisie".

The obvious answer would be to create a powerful coalition opposing the Communists and serving at the same time as a means of obtaining political influence and eventual control by big business. This is exactly what French financial interests did.

At first hesitantly, then with more and more vigor, they took over the reins of the Popular Republican Movement (MRP), although not disdaining the aid of more rabid rightwing groups such as the Republican Liberty Party of M. Mutter. In fact, in precincts where their combined vote might defeat a Communist or Socialist, the two parties pool their electorate.

Vichyism, Model 1947

The Mouvement Republican Populaire, to give the MRP its full French title, does not openly proclaim itself as the vehicle of Big Business. It presents itself, rather, as a progressive Roman Catholic party, somewhat along the line of the Christian Democratic parties in Germany and Italy.

Certainly it includes among its membership many sincere and well-meaning Roman Catholics, including Foreign Minister Georges Bidault. Bidault's record as an underground fighter against Nazism is outstanding. Even when the French hierarchy openly courted Vichy and accepted its financial benefits, Bidault stood fast.

Unfortunately, however, the MRP is not controlled by men like Bidault. Its policies are determined by semi-hidden leaders, men who rarely appear in the limelight and whose names are almost entirely unknown to the general French public.

Among the real leaders of the MRP are men such as Max Andre, linked to the Franco-Indochinese Bank and dictator of imperialist policies in Indochina; Count Pierre de Chevigne, editor of "Pays", member of the Jockey Club, favorite of the mighty Mirabaud family; Reille Soult, linked to huge mining, smelting and power trusts; or Andre Burlot, director of four huge insurance companies.

In alphabetical order after Bidault on the MRP executive committee, but completely unknown to the average Frenchman, are Andre Catrice and Andre Debray. These men are of special significance, for they point directly at the inevitable fountainhead of any new French fascism that might arise.

Debray is a stockholder in companies dealing in insurance (Assurances-Prevoyances), in oil (l'Omnium Francais des Petroles) and in construction work (Societe Nouvelle de Constructions des

Travaux). But, most important of all, he is a *member of the board of the Banque de Paris et des Pays-Bas.*

Catrice is part-owner of the Catrice Textile Mills and associated with "Le Monde", the "Times" of Paris. He also has an interest in three publishing houses —Editions du Mail, L'Image du Monde, and Editions Internationales. But, again most significant of all, Catrice is a financial associate of Charles Flory, *member of the board of the Banque de Paris et des Pays-Bas.*

The Banque de Paris et des Pays-Bas, Rue d'Antin, Paris, is the focal point where the interests of British, American and French finance capital merge. It is by far the biggest investment bank in France. Its activities spread over the world, into the French colonies, into a dozen foreign countries. But its power is still greater than its myriad fields of activity indicate. The Banque de Paris et des Pays-Bas works in extraordinarily close coordination with the House of Morgan. French investigators are convinced that it is Morgan-controlled.

Here is just one example of this strange liaison: Leonard Rist, formerly vice-president of Morgan interests in France, head of the policy service of the International Reconstruction Bank (Morgan-controlled), is the son of Charles Rist, administrator of the Banque de Paris et des Pays-Bas.

In other words, there is a grave possibility that the House of Morgan, seat of American imperialism and inevitably the source of any developing American fascism, is the prime mover, behind the scenes, of reaction in France.

Background For The New Vichy

French reaction, as visibly represented by the MRP and its rightwing allies, is playing a double game in the hope of driving France into an explosive crisis, preparatory to seizing power.

With one hand it encourages inflation, with its attendant evils of black markets, hoarding, lower and lower real wages and slow starvation; with the other hand it provokes the masses and checkmates any constructive moves by the government.

In the new French government, equal power is held by the MRP and the Communists, although the latter had the largest popular vote. The tactics of the MRP have been to checkmate any action by the Communists and to hamstring the Socialists, thrown into theoretical dominance by the balance of MRP and Communist strength.

Meanwhile the Bank of France, its policy dictated largely by associates of Robert Schumann, the MRP's ex-Finance Minister, continues to put eleven billion more francs into circulation every week.

The well-meaning but rather futile Socialist government, finally managing to put through a decree ordering a general five percent price reduction, discovers to its astonishment that business houses first boosted prices 15 or 20 percent, then lowered them the required five percent.

Parisians, just after reading statistics to the effect that there are more cattle on French farms than ever before, went without meat of any kind during most of January and February.

Self-sacrificing French miners, just after pushing coal production to an all-time high, learn with amazement that no coal at all was available for heating in Paris during the coldest part of January.

In the French colonies, Arabs, Malagasy and Africans look up from reading all about the "free-and-equal" French Union to listen to the echoes of machine-gun fire in Indo-China, where ex-SS men, clothed in the uniform of the Foreign Legion, do the bidding of French reaction.

Amid this planned confusionism, the average Frenchman, M. Jacques Bonhomme, is desperately looking for a square meal and a minimum of clothing for himself and his family. Jacques makes about 25 francs an hour now,

compared to about nine francs an hour back in 1938. His wages have gone up three times. This should make him happy, but it doesn't.

Jacques isn't happy because the price he has to pay, not just for a square meal, but for every necessity, has gone up 11 times over what it was in 1938. In other words, to make ends meet and have the same standard now as he did then, Jacques would have to make around 99 francs an hour instead of 25 francs.

Naturally, Jacques feels that something should be done about his plight, and fast. He cannot eat polysyllabic generalizations, such as those which will lure Uncle Sam's better-fed nephews and nieces to the polls in 1948. Jacques wants plain talk and at least the promise of quick results.

He is getting that promise from the MRP and from the Communist Party. If he swallows the demagogy of the MRP and brings it to power in the next few years, French big business will then have a "legal" basis for its dictatorship. If he follows the Communists, big business can be assured of Anglo-American support for its countermove. Whichever way Jacques jumps, the "haute bourgeoisie" figures, he's trapped.

Walls are also being built against any attempt by Jacques to break out of his trap—walls on the four sides of France. There are Anglo-American troops across the Rhine, a strange, "social-imperialist" government in Britain, a carefully nurtured clerical-fascism in Spain, and a similar, swiftly developing reaction bidding for power in Italy.

That doesn't mean, of course, that Jacques can't break out. A roughly similar situation existed some 150 years ago, when France's Jacques Bonhomme was much weaker than he is now. About that time, if you remember, the French Revolution took place.

APRIL FOOL IN SPAIN

By ARTHUR HANKEY

CHOOSING HIS PATTERN, no doubt, from the ugly, caterpillar who grows into a dainty butterfly, Spanish Dictator Francisco Franco metamorphosed himself, last April Fool's Day, into a Royal Regent. The man who laid Spain waste in the name of Fascism will now roost on the ruins, he says, in the name of Spanish Pretender Don Juan de Borbon, accompanied on his perch by none less than Enrique Cardinal Pla y Daniel, Primate of Spain.

Franco's metamorphosis, despite appearances, was not intended as an April Fool's joke. His proclamation of Spain as a "Roman Catholic Kingdom" was in his mind a serious attempt to blot out the stench of Fascism with a blend of royal attar of roses and holy water.

The roly-poly butcher had two aims: He hoped to win over the Monarchists, thus splitting his opposition; and he hoped to soothe the growing uneasiness of his main if not only ideological defender, the Vatican.

The disguise he chose seems rather makeshift; but it must be remembered that Franco and his clique were working fast and under great pressure. The seeds of political crisis in Spain, germinating off and on, reached a stage of explosive growth in January. Collapse of Franco appeared closer than ever. United Nations action of some sort was probable. Unity talks among the Opposition were optimistic. Guerrilla and underground activities increased.

At this point the British Foreign Office, undoubtedly in harmony with the State Department, stepped into the breach. Fearing that overthrow of Franco might mean a "leftist" government, Britain's Ernie Bevin contacted Spanish Conservative Trifon Gomez, key man

in the Republican government-in-exile, and, through the Duke of Alba, Spanish Pretender Don Juan.

The result of this British activity was the remodeling of the government-in-exile, with the aim of fitting it for participation in a "transitional" Spanish regime that would replace Franco. The result also was that the Monarchists were largely won over to such participation, although they held back slightly, insisting on a British guarantee that the "transitional" regime would be replaced by a monarchy as soon as practicable.

Informed of these negotiations, Franco was frightened. He had hoped that Britain and the United States, following their commercial policies, would overlook the clinging taint of Hitlerism in his regime and grant substantial support in exchange for economic and political concessions. Now, for the first time, he realized that even Washington and London did not think him a good investment.

Understandably agitated, the dictator called Cardinal Pla y Daniel to save him. The Cardinal has been one of Franco's firmest supporters, not necessarily through any love for him, but because of his belief, concurred in by his superiors, that Franco, up to the present, has been the best possible guarantee for the material interests of the Roman Catholic Church in Spain. Franco logically expected the Cardinal to come through for him in his crisis.

The Cardinal didn't say no, and he didn't say yes. Instead, he called in Martin Artajo, his "unofficial" representative in Franco's dictatorship, and worked out an alternative plan. It had four main points:

1. Franco and his clique would resign.

2. The Falange would disband.

3. Artajo would proclaim a provisional government, inviting "selected" Monarchists and Republicans to join him.

4. Framework of the new government would be a "Christian Democratic Party", set up on the basis of the "disbanded" Falange.

Artajo and the Cardinal had good reasons for being enthusiastic about their plan. It provided for almost all possible contingencies. The "Christian Democratic Party", controlling all the Falange machinery, its "arbeitsfront" and its police, could dictate the political line of the provisional government. "Free elections" could be called in perfect safety. The exterior taint of Fascism could be disguised. Britain and the U.S. couldn't possibly object to the scheme, since it would secure their investments and protect Spain from "leftists" while observing the proprieties necessary for foreign consumption. In fact, the plan could be considered a take-off on the Anglo-American "transitional government" idea.

When Franco learned of the scheme, however, he flew into a rage. He called together the four Falange members of his Cabinet and his principal associates. They were likewise appalled at the Cardinal's plan. They saw that the resignation of Franco and themselves would mean not only loss of political prestige for them, but at least a temporary reduction in the huge black market profits that Falange bosses rake in. Obviously, success of the Cardinal's plan depended upon their own sacrifice. They weren't ready to go as far as all that. They demanded that Cardinal Pla y Daniel think up something else.

The smiling Cardinal backed down a bit. The success of his "Christian Democratic" government, he realized, would depend on the cooperation of the Falange chiefs, who held all the key posts. If they opposed it, they could wreck the Falange machinery on which the whole immediate future of his scheme was based. The squabble might even leave room for Republicans to step in and win control. Then the Vatican's plans for a model state in Spain would go glimmering.

The Cardinal decided to play for time and take advantage of the first break in

the situation. He agreed to give Franco and his boys a chance to find another "solution", in conformity with the aims of the "Holy Crusade" and non-offensive to Washington and London. The "April Fool" proclamation was Franco's counter proposal.

Immediately after the Cardinal's offer of one more chance, Franco left Madrid for the country estate of the Duke of Medinaceli, in the hills above Toledo. He was accompanied by his brother, Nicolas, envoy to Portugal and unofficial ambassador to Pretender Don Juan. The Duke of Medinaceli, not well-known outside Spain, is a power among Monarchists. It is almost certain that the new touches on Franco's "regency" plan were devised at that time, and that they were tentatively approved by a responsible spokesman for Spanish monarchists.

Franco came back to Madrid rather jubilant. He had, he thought, won the support of the Monarchists, thus dividing his opposition. All that was necessary now was to work in a few measures suitably taking care of the interests of the Vatican and the Army—and making sure that balance of power remained with the Falange. How Franco tried to do this—with surprising naivete for a man of his experience—is best shown by the proclamation itself:

"Spain is a political unity, is a Catholic and Social State, constituted as a Kingdom, in accordance with its traditions. Head of the State is the Chieftain of the Crusade and Generalissimo of Armies, Don Francisco Franco y Bahmonde. A Council of the Kingdom will assist the Chief of State . . . composed of The Cardinal Primate . . . the Commanding General of the Supreme General Staff (and four more chosen directly or indirectly by the Falange)."

The proclamation added that "in case of the death or incapacity of the Chief of State, there will be called to succeed him that person of royal blood with the best right to the position. . . . " This, of course, was the nearest possible recognition by Franco that Pretender Don Juan should be his successor.

Thus, in a few paragraphs, Franco had, so he thought, appeased the Monarchists, guaranteed the interests of the Vatican by naming Spain a "Catholic State" and assigning a prominent regency seat to Cardinal Pla y Daniel, and allayed the restlessness of the Army by giving its biggest shot a seat right next to the Cardinal.

Unfortunately for the Spanish dictator, his chamber logic fell flat when it came into contact with reality. It failed to take into account two highly important factors: The absolute discredit he and his followers had fallen into at home and abroad; and the shrewd finagling of the Monarchists.

For Americans, bombarded with pro-Franco propaganda, it is hard to realize how Franco is loathed in the rest of the world. Inside and outside of Spain, among all civilized mankind, associating with Franco or Falangists automatically discredits those who do so. For that reason alone, no one inside Spain who is not already hopelessly tainted will now publicly collaborate with Franco; and no Spaniard outside of Spain who hopes to return will even consider working with the Falange.

The Monarchists are no exception. The Duke of Alba and his British backers are well aware that participation by Monarchists in any regime including Franco would spell their political death. But that did not bar them from privately and tentatively expressing approval for Franco's plan beforehand, to oppose it publicly once it was announced. They led him on, then dropped him. The Vatican and the Spanish Army can be expected to do the same, very soon. Franco is on his way out and nobody bets on a loser.

Obviously, Franco's regency scheme fell flat because the Monarchists, of whose support he had been assured and who were the key to success or failure of the plan, not only pulled out but

launched an offensive against him as soon as it was announced.

"Franco's plan is absolutely inacceptable," Pretender Don Juan sternly said. "The most important thing is that Franco get out. I am convinced that if Britain and America deal with the Spanish question in a practical way, it could be solved in three months."

By a practical way, of course, Don Juan means that Britain and the U. S. ought to throw their full weight behind the Monarchists.

And that is exactly what they, and the Vatican, are going to do, if the present trend of events is not affected by any powerful new developments.

Coached by Britain's Conservative Foreign Office crowd, headed by a little-known key-man, Sir Orme Sergeant, author of the Mediterranean Bloc policy that guides Britain's hand from Spain to Palestine, the Spanish Monarchists are getting ready to take over from Franco.

They already hold the balance of power among the opposition to Franco, badly split into Conservatives and Progressives. They are angling now for the support, in a loose coalition, of all Spanish Conservatives, including right-wing Republicans, disgruntled former Falangists and dissatisfied Army generals. Moreover, this support has been forthcoming. Trifon Gomez, who runs the present Republican government-in-exile, has pledged it. Even the Anarchist National Labor Federation (CNT) has agreed to work with the Monarchists against Franco.

As soon as this coalition shows signs of action, it is certain that Cardinal Pla y Daniel will throw the weight of the Roman Catholic Church behind it and at once put into effect the plan for a "Christian Democratic Party" which he worked out with Martin Artajo, and which would be in position to take over control of the government at any time, whether under a "monarchy" or an apparent coalition.

Unwittingly, it seems, Dictator Franco defined in his April Fool's Day proclamation the type of regime Spain will have for the next few years: "A Catholic State, constituted as a Kingdom."

Of course, the Spanish people might have something to say.

NCCJ APPEASES ONCE MORE

The National Conference of Christians and Jews has withdrawn its pamphlet "Week-Day Religious Education; Help Or Hindrance to Inter- Religious Understanding?" owing to Roman Catholic pressure. The pamphlet had a foreword by Paul H. Vieth, Chairman of the NCCJ Committee on Religious Education Materials and it had been presented by Isaac K. Beckes to Yale University as partial requirement for his Ph.D.

The pamphlet happens to be an honest attempt to assay the role of week-day religious programs, pointing out that Jewish textbooks are free from derogatory and antagonistic remarks, Protestant textbooks sometimes speak of the Jews as being inferior, and passages of an antagonistic or derogatory nature in Roman Catholic books are numerous. Such forthrightness is scarcely consonant with the shameful policy of appeasement pursued by the NCCJ, therefore we are not surprised that they have withdrawn the pamphlet.

THE REAL SCHUMACHER

By HEINZ POL

SOME WEEKS ago the newly founded German Trade Union Federation held its first convention at Berlin. The participants at the convention in a completely free vote elected the Federation's executive board. Twenty-three of the elected twenty-seven members of the board belonged to the Socialist Unity party, four were members of the Christian Democratic Union. The candidates of the Social Democratic party did not obtain enough votes to get even one single member into the board. However, the victorious Socialist Unity party after the voters had spoken offered one-fourth of the seats of the executive board to representatives of the Social Democratic party. The Social Democrats refused the offer, and the "Tagesspiegel", a Berlin daily licensed and patronized by the American Military Government, one day after the convention urged the Social Democrats to quit altogether the Trade Union Federation and to organize another "independent" trade union movement in Berlin and Western Germany.

This is just one litle example about the tactics of a party that calls itself "leftist" and which is being groomed by both the British and American authorities in Germany to serve the subtle aims of a policy directed to create in a few years a "new" Germany ready to fight, together with the representatives of Western Civilization, the Russians in particular and Communism in general. The leader of the new German Social Democratic party is Dr. Kurt Schumacher. His name has repeatedly made the headlines of certain American and British newspapers and magazines. But to state that Schumacher and his party are merely tools in the hands of some politicians and generals in London and Washington would only show half of the picture. In picking the German Social Democratic party for their purposes the British and American experts consciously or not rely on a party which through its theory and practice bears by far the heaviest part of responsibility for the birth, growth and triumph of Nazism. Since the "new" party under the leadership of Schumacher has not at all changed in theory and practice but is bent upon the maintenance of the "glorious past and tradition of the Social Democratic party" the hope for a really democratic and progressive Germany has become dark.

The revival on a big scale of Social Democracy in Germany under the leadership of Schumacher and his like could only lead to disaster. To be sure, there are people who would love this kind of disaster: about three months ago a secret poll was taken among the 300 members of the former German General Staff and High Command who as prisoners of war live comfortably in three Middle-England estates. The question as put by the highest ranking generals was: "Is there anybody today in Germany with whom one could work together if one were free and living in Germany?" 180 representatives of old Prussia and the "Lebensraum"-doctrine answered that in their opinion only one man could be trusted to rebuild the fatherland. It was, of course, Schumacher.

Kurt Schumacher is in his early fifties, one of the youngest of the many new political heads in Germany who have emerged from the Nazi holocaust. Before Hitler took over, Schumacher had been a Reichstag member of the Social Democratic party, a newspaper editor and a very able agitator. Of course he fought Hitler in many Reichstag speeches and hundreds of editorials. Still, the way he fought the poison was done in the typical Social Democratic fashion of that time: namely, to outdo Hitler in nationalistic phrases. "Not the Nazis are the real patriots, we are

by far the better Germans truly in love with our fatherland." This was the principal slogan of Schumacher and many other leading Social Democrats 15 years ago. The only practical consequence of the supernationalism of the Social Democrats was that millions of people went over to the Nazis whose patriotism seemed to be more genuine to them.

Since August 1914 when the overwhelming majority of the Social Democratic leaders betrayed the Second International and went over with frenzied enthusiasm to Wilhelm II and his "holy crusade" against Russia, France and the rest of the world, the party of Bebel, Ebert, Scheidemann, Noske, Wels and Co. has never become again truly democratic. To the delight of the Nazis and the still very nationalistic and reactionary minded German middle class of today, Schumacher in his speeches and proclamations talks very much like a combination of Bismarck, Noske and Hitler. That is a combination millions of Germans love—they have been raised to love it, a tradition which only a real revolution could destroy.

Since the British and American policy makers are determined to rebuild Germany on a strictly anti-revolutionary basis—the question e.g. to expropriate the big landowners in Western Germany has not even been discussed—the Social Democratic party under the leadership of Schumacher is a natural ally. Of course, Schumacher, who some months ago had officially visited Great Britain, is a very clever tactician. He does not just attack the Russians and denounce Communism, he also criticizes from time to time the attitude of French, American and British officials. This helps him considerably to play the role of the new savior of Germany.

He is even careful in choosing his surroundings when he addresses the people. Some weeks ago he spoke in the Ruhr district in the mining town of Oberhausen. "Potsdam", he shouted, "is a millstone of misery in German history. The Potsdam agreements are our doom. We do not deserve them". As he spoke thus, he stood before the war monument of the city hall commemorating the German victories of the war of 1870-71. Schumacher continued to attack the military occupation of Germany which in his opinion could only lead to "trouble". Europe could not be "free" without a "free" Germany. It goes without saying that William Asbury, the British Regional Commissioner for the district, speaking after Schumacher, endorsed his statements.

Schumacher's program which is the program of the party fits perfectly with the desires of the Nazis and Nazi infected parts of the population on the one hand and the designs of the Churchills, Bevins, Hoovers and Leahys on the other hand. Here are some highlights from the Social Democratic party line of today:

Germany must regain her lost territories in the East. Many months before Hoover toured Germany and came back with a report in which he showed so much concern for the American taxpayer and none for the appalling recurrence of chauvinism in Germany, Schumacher proclaimed: "The boundaries must be revised in the interest of economic efficiency. This is necessary, first of all, in the interest of British and, especially, American taxpayers." And he concluded his statement about the border problem with this open threat: "For the long run a nation of 70,000,000 people will remain a power to be reckoned with."

Well, this, of course, is not only a threat, it is at the same time, and even more so, an offer. Schumacher has repeatedly stressed the point that Germany even without the complete re-building of her industry retains her full war potential, namely her millions of men capable and willing to fight for their "freedom." It was the Social Democratic leadership after 1918 which wilfully laid the foundation stone of Germany's

re-armament physically and mentally. They would do the same thing today if they had the power. Mentally, Schumacher does everything to kindle the flame of extreme nationalistic feelings. His speeches and written proclamations abound with phrases that start: "We demand . . .", "We want . . .", "We are ready to recognize . . .", "We cannot accept . . ." etc.

Schumacher's favorite catch word is "Europe". Because he is for a new and better Europe, he wants a powerful Germany. So did Wilhelm II and Hitler. In one of his recent appeals to the American public (printed in the American Social Democratic weekly *The New Leader*) Schumacher dares to ask: "The basic question is: Shall Germany be subjected to an excessive drain for the benefit of nations which were injured by the Hitler regime, or shall Europe be reorganized from the ground up?" You see, poor, fumbling Hitler just "injured" some nations, why should Schumacher's Germans pay for that little damage? In another part of the same article, the author writes: "Hitler weakened Germany's case by blurring the limits of German territories." Otherwise, obviously, Hitler was perfect and Germany had a just case to attack the world. After Germany has given back all the territories Hitler had conquered, the whole problem is settled, in the eyes of the new leader as well as of *The New Leader* which approves enthusiastically every word Schumacher says or writes.

For, the domestic program of the German Social Democratic leadership consists only and exclusively of fighting to the end the Communists and those Socialists and other progressive elements who want to unify the parties of the Left and to clean up the country. Schumacher and his men who have their headquarters in British occupied Hannover have been denouncing everybody being suspected of not strictly Social Democratic thought to the British or American authorities as "Russian agents" or "spies" or "saboteurs" or even "Fascists". He calls the thriving Socialist Unity Party "a revival of Nazism under a new name". The Christian Democratic Union, a new Catholic dominated party which in some spots shows progressive tendencies has asked the other German political parties to set up an all-party committee to speak in the name of Germany pending formation of a central German government. All the other parties accepted the proposal, only Schumacher in the name of the Social Democrats declared: "We will not take part in discussions on such a subject." The reason? As long as there does exist the Socialist Unity party and all the other parties which according to Schumacher are only "Russian stooges", the Social Democrats will remain alone. This is the same tactic Hitler used at the beginning of his career when he ordered his National Socialists to keep away from any alliance with other parties and groups to preserve their "strength" and "purity".

It would be silly to say that Schumacher is a Nazi. He is something even more dangerous: he is a German nationalist who is hiding his true sentiments behind a velvet curtain of nice words about social progress, socialization of key industries, democracy, liberty and the like. The German Social Democratic leaders who for decades had been on the top of the biggest party of the country have been promising these beautiful things to the nation and to the world. Actually, they only succeeded in helping the imperialists of the Wilhelm era to make war and later to give Hitler the same opportunity. Today, Schumacher, with the more or less tacit approval of his friends from across the Channel and the Atlantic is trying his skill and energy to get his people ready for the next war against the Russians.